DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 703 RC 005 649

AUTHOR Maynes, J. O., Jr.
TITLE House Bill No. 1: Special English Classes. Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Dept. of Education, Phoenix.
PUB DATE Oct 71
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; *Bilingual Education; *English (Second Language); Minority Groups; *Primary Grades; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Spanish Speaking; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Arizona

ABSTRACT

Defining the overall objective of bilingual education to be the integration of the child into the mainstream of American life while maintaining audiolingual skills in both English and the native language without losing certain aspects of the subculture, this report summarizes information from 19 school districts involved in special English classes funded under the Arizona State House Bill No. 1. Utilizing results derived from the Monroe Oral Language Scale for 16 of the 19 school districts involving approximately 6,000 predominately Spanish-speaking or American Indian children (grades 1 through 3), significant progress in oral language development during the interim between pre- and post-tests was found. Although no controls were used to account for maturation effects, it was deemed probable that the gains were due to the special English classes. Among the recommendations, it is noted that a uniform testing methodology be implemented and that the comparison of results between different school districts be avoided. Further recommendations encompass financing and program development. Two references and 1 table are included. A related document is ED 044 192. (MJB)

ED055703

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RECEIVED
NOV 2 1971
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

HOUSE BILL NO. 1

SPECIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

Evaluation

Prepared and compiled by

J. O. "Rocky" Maynes, Jr.
Bilingual Specialist
Director, Migrant Child Education Division

for

W. P. Shofstall, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Arizona Department of Education

October, 1971

RC005649

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction.	1
II.	House Bill No. 1 - Special English Classes.	4
III.	Guidelines as approved by State Board of Education on August 25, 1969.	8
IV.	Allocation of Special English Classes 1969-70 and 1970-71 (State Contribution and School Contribution). . .	15
V.	Potential Number of Students for Special English Classes Who Speak a Language Other than English	17
VI.	Summary of Evaluation: Pre and Post Test Results	19
VII.	Recommendations for Improvement of House Bill No. 1 . . .	25
VIII.	Summary	28

INTRODUCTION

The overall objective in the education of the bilingual child is his integration into the mainstream of American life. This does not mean that the bilingual child must give up his home language and his sub-culture, but rather that he be functional in both English and his home language. For the bilingual child to compete effectively whether in education, in a job, or in social situations, he must acquire the audio-lingual skills to the degree necessary for whatever role his abilities enable him to play.

Emphasis must be placed initially in the development of the audio-lingual skills (listening and speaking) of the bilingual child if he is to find success later in the skills of reading and writing. Nelson Brooks of Yale University brings out the importance of early audio-lingual learning and training in the following points:

1. Language competence on the part of the teacher and effective instructional materials are basic necessities. Equally significant is the manner of presentation to the learner.
2. Language is learned, systematic, symbolic vocal behavior; a culturally acquired, universal, and exclusive mark of man.
3. Words may refer to what is in the immediate environment of speaker and hearer, in reality or pictured. This is a use of words as signs. But words may also refer to what is not in the environment at all, except for what is in the minds of speaker and hearer. This is the use of words as symbols; <u>it is by far the commonest use that human beings make of language</u>. This insight serves as a reminder that we must get beyond what

can be seen and reacted to in the immediate environment before we enter upon the proper field of language symbolism. The importance of this for the early levels of language learning hardly needs to be stressed.

4. Different levels of meaning are to be found in terms and in propositions. This is why vocabulary must be learned in context, and the study of word lists, other than those made by the user himself, is a waste of time.
5. Language is a central feature of the complex of characteristic social patterns of belief and behavior which are referred to as a culture. The words of a language relate to the culture in which it is spoken, and without knowledge of that culture, the meaning of words can never be fully understood. (Reading readiness.)
6. Language behavior is not a matter of solving problems but of pe.forming habits so well learned that they are automatic. In the formation of language habits the imitation of a good model is highly important.
7. The skills of hearing, speaking, reading, and writing are all involved in language behavior. In the audio-lingual phase, language functions purely on its own. The visual-graphic phase is ancillary to language and important to it, but it can easily be foregone, as it is constantly in the daily life of everyone. All four skills should be taught in a carefully prescribed sequence and proportion of allotted time.
8. Increment learning is particularly significant. One does not learn by making mistakes, but rather by giving the right response. If this can be given promptly and easily, with

little or no waste in the form of wrong responses, learning is quicker and better.

9. Both analysis and analogy play important roles in the development of language behavior. More importance is given to analogy and less to analysis until a considerable body of language materials has been learned.

10. Every language has a grammar peculiar to itself, fully understandable only in terms of that language. There is a grammar of talk and a grammar of writing, and these differ at many points.

11. Language is what issues from the mouths of living speakers. Language on paper is a derived and secondary form of language.

12. A principal objective is to use the English language as it is used in American culture. Nevertheless, in order to establish semantic meaning at early levels, some use may be made of the child's home language.

State of Arizona
House of Representatives
Twenty-ninth Legislature
First Regular Session

CHAPTER 95

HOUSE BILL 1

AN ACT

RELATING TO EDUCATION; PROVIDING A SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR TEACHING THE USE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN THE FIRST THREE GRADES OF COMMON SCHOOLS; AMENDING SECTION 15-202, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING TITLE 15, CHAPTER 10, BY ADDING ARTICLE 10, CONSISTING OF SECTIONS 15-1097, 15-1098, 15-1099, AND MAKING AN APPROPRIATION.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Legislative intent

The purpose of this act is to provide a special program for teaching the use and understanding of the English language, placing the supervision of the program under the state board of education and superintendent of public instruction, and making an appropriation.

Sec. 2. Sec. 15-202, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

15-202. Conducting of public schools in English language, bilingual instruction

A. All schools shall be conducted in the English language, except special classes as provided in subsection B of this section.

B. In the first three grades of any common school district where there are pupils who have difficulty in writing, speaking or understanding the English language because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or exclusively, the district may provide special programs of bilingual instruction to the extent deemed necessary to improve or

accelerate the comprehension and speech of the English language by such pupils.

Sec. 3. Title 15, chapter 10, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding a new article 10, to read:

ARTICLE 10. SPECIAL ENGLISH TRAINING

15-1097. Special education program

A. There shall be a special education program to carry out the provisions of this article subject to certification by the state superintendent of public instruction and pursuant to the rules and regulations prescribed by the state board of education relating to the administration of this article.

B. The state board of education shall establish:

1. Testing standards and qualification requirements for students to qualify for each grade level under this article prior to and after completion of the program.

2. Minimum qualifications for instructors to teach under this article.

3. That common schools seeking support under this article have suitable facilities.

C. The superintendent of public instruction shall enforce the compliance of school districts with the requirements of subsection B of this section.

15-1098. Powers of the governing body of a school district; program

The governing body of a school district may:

A. Provide a special course of instruction for common school children in the first three grades who, because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or

exclusively, are having difficulty in writing, speaking or understanding the English language. This special instruction in the English language shall be in addition to the regular course of instruction prescribed in all school districts.

B. Employ special teachers for the operation of special classes of English instruction.

C. In cooperation with another district or districts, establish special classes of English instruction for children who are having difficulty with the English language.

D. If the governing body of a school district complies with the provisions contained in this article, the special class or classes may be conducted by the school district in a classroom or school facility owned and maintained by the school district, or the school district may contract with other public agencies, within or without the district, for the use of facilities in which to further the education of children who are having difficulty with the English language.

E. Each child who qualifies under this section shall be limited to one course of instruction.

15-1099. Appropriation and apportionment; approval of program

A. Those students who qualify for this special program of instruction who are presently included in the appropriation and apportionment made pursuant to sections 15-1211 and 15-1212 and the county levy as provided in section 15-1233 shall receive in addition thereto, an appropriation by the legislature to each school district providing special education classes under the provisions of this article twenty-five dollars per unit of average

daily attendance per annum for each special education student taught by the district and this appropriation shall be made on an actual per capita per annum basis as shown by the records of the superintendent of public instruction.

B. The appropriation shall be computed with reference to the estimated number of special education students as provided in section 15-1097 to be taught during the current year in classes having a minimum of not less than one hundred twenty minutes nor more than two hundred forty minutes of instruction per school day.

C. The appropriations and apportionment provided under the terms of this section shall not be granted to the governing body of a school district unless the district complies with the provisions of this article and the conditions and standards prescribed by the superintendent of public instruction pursuant to rules and regulations of the state board of education. A school district program for education of children having difficulty with English, shall be presented to the state board of education for approval.

D. Per capita appropriations made pursuant to this section shall not be included in the budget six per cent limit check for the purpose of determining the permissible total operational budget of a school district.

Sec. 4. Appropriation

The sum of one hundred thousand dollars is appropriated to the superintendent of public instruction for the purposes provided in this act.

Approved by the Governor - April 16, 1969
Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State - April 17, 1969

GUIDELINES

Chapter 95
HOUSE BILL 1
An Act

As approved by the
ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
August 25, 1969

PROGRAM INFORMATION

The State of Arizona Bilingual Education Program, House Bill No. 1, is designed to provide a special program for teaching the use and understanding of the English Language, placing the supervision of the program under the State Board of Education and Superintendent of Public Instruction, and making an appropriation.

Special classes may be established in the first three grades of any common school district where there are pupils who have difficulty in understanding and speaking or writing the English language because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or exclusively. The school district may provide special programs of bilingual instruction to the extent deemed necessary to improve or accelerate the comprehension and speech of the English language by such pupils.

House Bill No. 1 affirms the primary importance of English; however, it also recognizes that a child's mother tongue which is other than English can have a beneficial effect upon his education when the child's mother tongue is used as a bridge or a tool in the first three grades to learning English.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Emphasis

A. Under House Bill No. 1 a common school district or a combination of common school districts may make application in order to provide a special course of instruction for common school children in the first three grades who, because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or exclusively, are having difficulty in understanding and speaking or writing the English language. Each child who qualifies under this section shall be limited to one course of instruction which means that it shall be one year in duration. Once a child has participated in a special course funded by House Bill No. 1 for one year, he (she) shall not be eligible the following years.

B. Testing for purposes of identifying qualified students to participate in this program.

1. A test must be administered by each common school district for the purpose of identifying children who are in need of a special English program. The selection of the instrument used shall be left to the discretion of the applying district. The testing procedure shall be

specified in the proposal as to name of test, date of administration, and indication of need as shown by the test.

It is the responsibility of each applying district to present its proposal in such a way that the needs for the special English program are supported by data from this testing program. This statement, testing procedures and identification of need, will be one of the primary criteria for selection of the proposal by the evaluation committee.

Results of identification test may be used as baseline data to determine the English language level of each participant.

2. The children of the special oral English language program shall be tested after completion of the special program in order to evaluate the gains made while participating in this program. This information shall be summarized and made available to the State Department of Public Instruction at the end of the school year.

C. Qualification of teachers.

1. All teachers shall have in their possession a valid teaching certificate as is required

by the law of the State of Arizona.

2. It is highly recommended that teachers teaching in the special program be bilingual (English-Spanish, English-Navajo, etc.) as the situation merits it. If a qualified bilingual teacher is not available then it is highly recommended that the classroom teacher be furnished a bilingual aide.

D. The availability of suitable facilities.

1. The common school district shall make available suitable facilities for the establishment of the special program.

E. Funding

1. An appropriation by the legislature to each school district providing special education classes shall receive twenty-five dollars under the provisions of this article per unit of average daily attendance per annum for each special education student taught by the district and this appropriation shall be made on an actual per capita per annum basis as shown by the records of the superintendent of public instruction.

2. The special course of instruction and the regular course of instruction are to be taught within the regular two hundred forty minute school day.

3. "Per capita appropriations made pursuant to this section shall not be included in the budget six percent limit check for the purpose of determining the permissible total operational budget of a school district."

4. The Attorney General substantiated the following principles in administering this program:

   a. The ADA of pupils for which the $25 State aid is to be apportioned shall be the first six months' actual ADA of such pupils in the year the course is being conducted.

   b. The ADA of bilingual pupils will <u>not</u> be reported monthly to the State Department of Public Instruction but will be recorded only on the claim to be filed with the State Department of Public Instruction by a participating school district after the first six months of school has transpired. (Local district attendance records on such pupils must be maintained as is currently done for deaf and blind pupils and retained for subsequent audit with the district's other attendance records.)

c. On the claim (SDPI Form D-15 which will be available for distribution through County School Superintendents' offices in January 1970), it will be necessary for the superintendent of a participating district to certify that the pupils for whom State aid is sought have not taken such a course previously for which $25 in State aid was paid.

d. During the first year of this program - namely 1969-70 - the amount of bilingual State aid a school district anticipates receiving need not be included in its expenditure budget. After Form D-15 claims have been paid by the State Department of Public Instruction in the spring of 1970, the State Department of Public Instruction will certify to each County School Superintendent the amounts distributed to the districts of his county for this form of State aid. Such amounts may then be added by the County School Superintendent to such districts' operational expenditure budgets in whatever categories and lines he and the district superintendent deem advisable. (This procedure provides that any such amounts may be expended outside the Budget

6% Limit as is permitted by ARS 15-1099D.)

e. In 1969-70 the State Department of Public Instruction will pay D-15 claims in the order received until the $100,000 appropriated for the purposes of this program is fully expended. Since no more than 4000 bilingual pupils can be aided in 1969-70, it behooves each participating district to file its D-15 claim as soon after the first six months of school as possible.

Allocation of Special English Classes
1969-70

County & School District	State Contribution	School Contribution	Average Daily Attendance
COCHISE COUNTY:			
Douglas Elem. #27	$ 3,560.70	$16,400.00	142.428
Naco Elem. #23	2,374.47	1,900.00	95.951
GRAHAM COUNTY:			
Ft. Thomas Elem. #7	2,822.00	1,050.00	115.740
MARICOPA COUNTY:			
Avondale Elem. #44	2,882.08	2,326.02	115.283
Dysart Elem. #89	9,059.07	-0-	374.640
Kyrene Elem. #28	1,073.80	-0-	42.950
Mesa Elem. #4	7,183.78	19,663.14	287.351
Phoenix Elem. #1	34,894.88	1,167.00	1590.225
Roosevelt Elem. #66	737.50	164.00	29.500
Tempe Elem. #3	8,010.09	-0-	330.7355
Wilson Elem. #7	2,420.75	-0-	96.830
NAVAJO COUNTY:			
Whiteriver Elem. #20	443.58	6,821.48	17.743
PIMA COUNTY:			
Sunnyside Elem. #12	1,605.68	5,078.00	64.227
Tucson Elem. #1	13,865.98	5,800.00	554.639
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY:			
Nogales Elem. #1	3,545.03	4,000.00	143.591
YUMA COUNTY:			
Gadsden Elem. #32	1,719.42	2,119.00	74.5145
Parker Elem. #27	1,216.59	-0-	51.309
Somerton Elem. #11	2,584.60	3,440.00	106.745
	$100,000.00	$69,928.64	*4234.4020

*Only 4000 of these children were funded by the $100,000.00 state allocation.

Allocation of Special English Classes
1970-71

County & School District	State Contribution	School Contribution	Average Daily Attendance
COCHISE COUNTY:			
Douglas Elem. #27	$ 4,150.58	$ 900.00	166.023
Naco Elem. #23	1,005.65	703.00	40.226
COCONINO COUNTY:			
Tuba City Elem. #15	8,976.70	11,858.30	359.068
GRAHAM COUNTY:			
Ft. Thomas Elem. #17	950.00	250.00	38.000
MARICOPA COUNTY:			
Avondale Elem. #44	880.40	2,374.80	35.216
Dysart Elem. #89	6,135.32	4,250.00	245.413
Kyrene Elem. #28	431.65	3,500.00	17.266
Mesa Elem. #4	8,596.78	1,430.33	343.871
Phoenix Elem. #1	13,287.60	3,847.00	531.504
Roosevelt Elem. #66	8,425.00	1,200.00	337.000
Tempe Elem. #3	3,852.63	401.00	154.105
Tolleson Elem. #17	2,116.25	542.00	84.650
Wilson Elem. #7	4,638.25	700.00	185.530
NAVAJO COUNTY:			
Kayenta Elem. #27	2,687.98	1,800.00	107.519
PIMA COUNTY:			
Sunnyside Elem. #12	1,564.75	2,475.50	62.590
Tucson Elem. #1	14,544.40	-0-	581.776
PINAL COUNTY:			
Kenilworth Elem. #28	591.50	1,304.00	23.660
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY:			
Nogales Elem. #1	6,919.35	4,000.00	276.774
YUMA COUNTY:			
Gadsden Elem. #32	558.83	3,500.00	22.353
Parker Elem. #27	807.50	1,130.50	32.300
Somerton Elem. #11	5,051.50	-0-	202.060
	$96,172.72	$46,166.43	3846.904

V. Potential Number of Students for Special English Classes Who Speak a Language Other Than English.

The "1970-71 Racial Ethnic Survey" conducted by the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Arizona Department of Education, shows the potential number of students who speak a language other than English who are in grades first, second, and third.

Following is a chart showing the number of students who are potentially non-English speakers or who may be limited English speaking ability students. This table was extracted from the above study.

Racial and Ethnic Study of Arizona Public Schools Grade Distribution: Grades 1-3.

	Spanish Surname	Oriental	American Indian	Other Nonwhite	Total
Grade 1	8,619	151	2.506	32	11,308
Grade 2	8,248	174	1,967	48	10,437
Grade 3	7,416	186	1,879	29	9,510
Total	24,283	511	6,352	109	31,255

Definitions: The four racial and ethnic categories utilized in relation to House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes were: (1) Spanish surname and other Latin American; (2) Oriental: those recognized visually or by surname as of Chinese, Japanese, or Korean descent; (3) American Indian: regardless of surname, those recognized visually as of American Indian descent or so identified in school or community; (4) Other nonwhite: Filipinos, Hawaiians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and Asians other than those counted under Oriental.

It is estimated that about 75% of Spanish surnamed and American Indian children would be in need of an oral English program in the

primary grades (1-3). The reasoning behind this 75% figure is that at least 75% of Spanish surnamed people live in "barrios" (Spanish surnamed neighborhoods) or in towns where a large percentage of the population is Spanish surnamed. The 75% figure is also a conservative figure regarding the number of American Indians who live in reservations. The fact that these children are raised in "barrios" and reservations contributes to their lack of exposure to oral English in general. For this reason, when these children start school, in many cases they are unable to fully understand the teacher and compete in classroom educational activities with their anglo peers.

SUMMARY REPORT

HOUSE BILL NO. 1

SPECIAL ENGLISH CLASSES

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS - PRE AND POST TEST RESULTS

This report is designed to summarize information from school districts involved in Special English Classes under House Bill No. 1. Emphasis has been on oral Language development, vocabulary, and comprehension. Each district selected its own method of evaluating progress, and this report will attempt to synthesize that information in as simple and concise a way as possible and yet maintain the essence of the individual evaluations.

A variety of tests were used by the different school districts to report the progress of the children in the special English classes. Some of the districts used and reported the results on more than one test. Sixteen of the nineteen school districts reported scores on the Monroe Oral Language Scale. Therefore, to simplify the evaluation of the total program, the Monroe Oral Language Scale was selected as the evaluating instrument when this choice was available.

Monroe Oral Language Scale is evaluation of syntax or sentence structure of oral language on a scale of from 1 through 5 beginning with no response and one word response at level 1 to complex sentences at level 5.

Monroe (1965) postulates that children who have not reached Step 3 or Step 4 on this scale have not developed sufficient language

ability to interpret a picture in a primer and react to the text that accompanies the picture.

It can readily be seen that Monroe's Step 3 is the first step in which the use of a movable occurs. Therefore, one could reason that, until the child has reached a stage of language maturity which includes the use of movables, he does not have sufficient language ability to succeed in beginning reading experiences.

The following table will evaluate the scores of the Monroe Oral Language Scale in two ways. First, the percentage of students taking the test at the beginning of the year whose oral language ability as measured by Monroe Oral Language Scale was adequate or better than adequate for the beginning reading program.

Also, the percentage of students taking the test at the end of the year whose oral language ability as measured by Monroe Oral Language Scale was adequate or better than adequate for the beginning reading program.

Second, the probability that the program was the cause of the gains during the year. However, no controls were used to see if the gains were a result of maturity.

A composite evaluation of all the sixteen districts is made at the end.

School District	percentage of students whose oral language ability is adequate to enter the reading program		Probability that improvement was due to Special English Classes
	beginning the year	ending the year	
Avondale	41%	84%	99 1/2%
Dysart	31%	84%	99.5%
Ft. Thomas	1%	50%	99.5%
Gadsden	0%	73%	99.5%
Kenilworth	0%	80%	99.5%
Kyrene	53%	100%	99.5%
Naco	1%	38%	99.5%
Nogales	19%	85%	99.5%
Phoenix	32%	96%	99.5%
Roosevelt	28%	87%	99.5%
Somerton	37%	74%	99.5%
Sunnyside	0%	74%	99.5%
Tempe	25%	91%	99.5%
Tolleson	3%	92%	99.5%
Tucson	24%	69%	99.5%
Wilson	35%	91%	99.5%
Composite	27%	87%	99.5%

Caution must be used in trying to compare one school district with another as the Monroe Oral Language Scale does not score a difference between the student who knows English but talks little and the student who speaks very little English. The student without English will have much more to learn before he can begin reading than the student who is shy and does very little talking.

The evaluation of the three other districts follows:

Kayenta Elementary School District reported pretest and post test grade levels on a language test. They did not report which language test it was. A t-test of correlated means was done on the grade levels. The results were significant to the .005 level of significance.

The Douglas Public Schools were evaluated using a modified Strickland (1962) evaluation. The report showed a significant increase in the number of words and number of sentences. It also reported a significant decrease in the number of partial sentences, indicating a marked improvement in oral language patterns.

Tuba City Public School report is difficult to evaluate because only mean gain scores were reported. No inference can be made from these scores except that there was a gain.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

This report summarizes the results of oral language evaluations done in 19 districts involving over 6,000 children under House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes.

The kinds of tests used in evaluating progress in oral language development are numerous and varied making it difficult to interpret and compare results. Some of the tests have not been standardized so there are no norms against which the progress of the children can be compared. A more appropriate and consistant means of evaluating progress under this program would be desirable from the standpoint of analyzing results.

Total results from the evaluating done in each district showed significant progress in oral language development during the interim between the pre and post tests. The range for individuals was from those who made no progress to those who made a marked and significant progress. It would be most difficult and, perhaps, unwise to attempt to compare results between districts as the make-up of school populations vary. For instance, a youngster in South Phoenix may live in a much different linguistic and social environment than a youngster from the south side of Douglas, Arizona.

It should be noted that although progress has been made in each of the programs, that many of the youngsters are still below a level of proficiency in the language that would allow them success in a beginning program of reading instruction.

Reference List

Monroe, Marion. Necessary Preschool Experiences for Comprehending Reading. Reading and Inquiry, 1965, 10, 45-46.

Strickland, Ruth G. The language of elementary school children: Its relationship to the language of reading textbooks and the quality of reading of selected children. Bulletin of the School of Education Indiana University. July, 1962, 38 (4).

VII. Recommendations to Improve House Bill No. 1 - Special English Classes:

1. Raise the twenty-five dollars ($25) per child funding to a minimum of fifty dollars ($50) per child.

   a. At the present time, if a school identifies 30 children for this program the school would receive seven hundred fifty dollars ($750) which means that the school could not even hire a bilingual aide. If this same school was to receive fifty dollars ($50) per child, the school would be in a better position to hire a bilingual aide at the going rate of sixty dollars ($60) per week for 36 weeks. The aide would be under the direction of a certified teacher if the funding were placed at the recommended fifty dollars ($50) per child. Even then the school would have to demonstrate some local effort and concern financially.

2. Eliminate the ruling that a child can participate in the special English classes only one year. This should be raised to three years (first grade through third grade).

   a. There are many children, particularly those that have recently arrived from Mexico to make their home in this country and those children who live in border towns like Douglas, Naco, Nogales, San Luis and Somerton, who may need to be in the special English classes two or three years. Once a child gains the English proficiency level needed to function in the

regular school program he would then be removed from this program whether it is after one, two, or three years; and he would be placed entirely in the regular school program.

Up to this point in our special English classes throughout the state, we are finding that there are students that should continue in this program for at least another year.

3. Delete "writing" from House Bill No. 1, section 2, paragraph B, lines 14-18, page 1 which reads as follows:

> In the first three grades of any common school district where there are pupils who have difficulty in writing, speaking or understanding the English language because they are from an environment wherein another language is spoken primarily or exclusively, the district may provide special programs of bilingual instruction to the extent deemed necessary to improve or accelerate the comprehension and speech of the English language by such pupils.

The reason for the deletion of the word "writing" is that it is not consistant with the emphasis stressed in the bill "to improve or accelerate the comprehension and speech of the English language by such pupils." A second reason for the deletion of the word "writing" would be that the greatest majority of first graders cannot perform the skill of writing which consequently would qualify all bilingual first graders in the state. The duty of teaching reading and writing becomes the responsibility of the regular language arts program.

4. That the appropriation of one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) be raised to an amount that will permit any school district to establish a special English class, if the need exists.

5. It is highly recommended that monies be available to hire a full-time bilingual consultant who will help develop special English classes and who will help monitor the total state program. Job description:

   a. To provide services to all school districts, especially the small ones, in drafting and developing programs which will meet the oral English needs of the "bilingual child."

   b. To provide assistance in the identification of areas of greatest need for those special English programs that will be set up.

   c. To provide constant, year-round service to school districts that have special English classes and to monitor such programs.

   d. To report to the Legislature and to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction the progress of such programs by placing the responsibility of supervision of the program under this new office.

SUMMARY

It appears that House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes, even though it has only been operational for two years, has made a significant contribution to oral English development for Spanish-surnamed and Indian children in Arizona. This being the main objective of the program, it would warrant further efforts in not only continuing the program, but in expanding it. This expansion could be done in one of three ways:

1. The funding for schools could be raised from the $25 per child to $50 per child. In this way the schools could better meet their responsibilities of meeting the oral English needs of the bilingual child by providing the bilingual personnel, instructional materials and instructional supplies needed.

2. Another way could be that instead of providing X number of dollars per child, the state would allocate schools' funds based on program development. Each school would submit a project which would be reviewed by the Arizona Department of Education and approved on its merits. However, there is one shortcoming to the program developing system, and that is unless the Legislature appropriates more than the $100,000 as it did for 1971-72, districts like Tucson No. 1 and Phoenix Elementary No. 1 could very easily utilize the total appropriations, leaving dozens of small districts without a program.

3. Develop a policy that each local school district must provide oral English programs for those children who need it.

If the recently established statewide reading policy is to be successful, children must first learn to comprehend and speak English before they can learn to read and write it.

Nevertheless, House Bill No. 1, Special English Classes gave the bilingual child a vital tool and experience in the development of this very necessary skill, oral English.